

Application No.: 10/799,061

5

Docket No.: 524322001200

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005, claims 1-16 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-16 in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 1 for the term "a die placement" in line 3. Applicant asserts that the use of the indefinite article is appropriate. In particular, the preamble of claim 1 refers to "selecting a die placement" and step a) in claim 1 refers to "obtaining a die placement." Note, however, that the die placement obtained in step a) is not necessarily the same as the die placement referred to in the preamble. Instead, the process of obtaining a die placement in step a) and adjusting the die placement in step d), in addition to steps b) and c), is the process by which "a die placement" is selected in claim 1. Thus, the use of the definite article as proposed by the Examiner would be inappropriate.

The Examiner objected to claim 2 for the term "a die placement" in line 1. Again, Applicant asserts that the use of the indefinite article is appropriate. In particular, claim 2 recites iterating steps b) to d) to obtain "a die placement with a minimum number of touchdowns needed to test the dies in the die placement." Note that this die placement (i.e., the die placement with the minimum number of touchdowns) is not necessarily the same as the die placement being adjusted in step d). In fact, if the die placement being adjusted in step d) was the "die placement with the minimum number of touchdowns," then it would not need to be adjusted. Thus, the use of the definite article as proposed by the Examiner would be inappropriate.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,640,423 (the Johnson reference).

sf-1980100

Application No.: 10/799,061

6

Docket No.: 524322001200

Independent claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to clarify that the "die placement defines the locations on the wafer on which the dies are to be fabricated." In contrast, the Johnson reference relates to placement and bonding of a die on a substrate after the die has been diced or cut from the wafer on which it was formed. Thus, the "die placement" recited in claims 1, 8, and 14 are non-analogous to the placement of dies referred to in the Johnson reference.

In particular, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the die holder 100 disclosed in the Johnson reference corresponds to the die placement obtained in step a) of claim 1. As depicted in FIG. 6 and described in column 10, lines 49-57, multiple dice 26 are supported on die holder 100 by a "sticky" sheath 152. Die holder 100 does not define "the locations on the wafer on which the dies are to be fabricated," and, thus, is not the same as the "die placement" recited in claims 1, 8, and 14.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also asserted that probe 604 corresponds to the tester head recited in claim 1. Note that claims 1, 8, and 14 recite that the die placement is adjusted to reduce the number of touchdowns (the number of times the tester head is lowered) to test the dies in the die placement. However, as depicted in FIG. 47C and described in column 10, lines 50-67, the Johnson reference discloses that probe 604 is a component of an oscillation frequency detection assembly 600 that controls the amount of bump height compression of the die, the substrate, or both, during bonding. The Johnson reference does not disclose adjusting the die placement on die holder 100 to reduce the number of touchdowns made by probe 604.

Because the Johnson reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 8, and 14, Applicant asserts that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable over the Johnson reference. Additionally, Applicants assert that claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15, 16 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims.

sf-1980100

Application No.: 10/799,061

7

Docket No.: 524322001200

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 524322001200. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: October 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6373

sf-1980100